

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Claims 1-20 remain pending in the patent application. Applicants respectfully request further examination and reconsideration in view of the remarks set forth below. Applicants respectfully submit that the amendments herein to the patent application do not add new matter to it.

35 U.S.C. §102 Rejections

Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Dang et al., U.S. Patent Number 5,757,594 (hereinafter Dang).

CLAIM 1

Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within newly amended independent Claim 1. For instance, amended Claim 1 recites in part (emphasis added):

provided said electronic device is being slid out of said equipment rack, preventing with an electronic locking module any remaining electronic device of said plurality of electronic devices from being slid out of said equipment rack thereby reducing the chances that said equipment rack will tip over;

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach the above combination as specifically recited in amended Claim 1. For example, Dang is silent with regard to reducing the chances that an equipment rack will tip over. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 1, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIM 8

Applicants respectfully assert that Dang fails to teach subject matter recited within newly amended independent Claim 8. For instance, amended Claim 8 recites in part (emphasis added):

a locking module for preventing a second electronic device coupled to said equipment rack from being slid out of said equipment rack to reduce the chances that said equipment rack will tip over;

Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach the above combination as explicitly recited in amended Claim 8. For example, Dang is silent with regard to reducing the chances that an equipment rack will tip over. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 8, Applicants respectfully contend that Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 8. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 8 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIM 15

Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach subject matter recited within newly amended independent Claim 15. For instance, amended Claim 15 recites in part (emphasis added):

an electronic control module coupled to said electronic sensor module and said electronic locking module, wherein said system reduces the chances that said equipment rack will tip over.

Applicants respectfully contend that Dang does not teach the above combination as specifically recited in amended Claim 15. For example, Dang is silent with regard to reducing the chances that an equipment rack will tip over. Since Dang fails to teach at least one element recited in amended Claim 15, Applicants respectfully assert that

Dang cannot anticipate amended Claim 15. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 15 is allowable over Dang.

CLAIMS 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20

Applicants respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 1, 8 and 15 are allowable over Dang based on the rationale discussed above. As such, their respective dependent Claims 2-7, 9-14, and 16-20 are also allowable over Dang.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 1-20.

The Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative if the Examiner believes such action would expedite resolution of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP



Dated: JUNE 1, 2005

Thomas M. Catale
Registration No.: 46,434

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Two North Market Street, Third Floor
San Jose, CA 95113

Phone: (408) 938-9060
Facsimile: (408) 938-9069